

AVON RICHARDSON, JR.,

Plaintiff,

v.

MICHAEL J. ASTRUE,
Commissioner of Social Security,

Defendant.

Case 4:09-cv-00079-D Document 27 Filed 06/14/10 Page 1 of 2

The court has reviewed the M&R, the record, and plaintiff's objections. As for those portions of the M&R to which plaintiff made no objection, the court is satisfied that there is no clear error on the face of the record.

The court has reviewed de novo the portions of the M&R to which plaintiff objected. Essentially, plaintiff objects that substantial evidence does not "support the ruling of the ALJ and the Commissioner's denial of benefits." Pl.'s Obj. 2. In making this objection, plaintiff contends that Judge Daniel erred in concluding that the evidence that plaintiff submitted to the Appeals Council was cumulative and not material. *Id.* at 4–5. Plaintiff also contends that Judge Daniel erred in analyzing the ALJ's credibility determination. *Id.* at 5–6.

Judge Daniel thoroughly explained why plaintiff's arguments lack merit. The court agrees with Judge Daniel and need not repeat his analysis. The objections lack merit and are denied.

Accordingly, the court adopts the M&R [D.E. 25]. Plaintiff's motion for judgment on the pleadings [D.E. 18] is DENIED, and defendant's motion for judgment on the pleadings [D.E. 19] is GRANTED. Defendant's final decision is AFFIRMED, and this action is DISMISSED. The Clerk is directed to close the case.

SO ORDERED. This 14 day of June 2010.


JAMES C. DEVER III
United States District Judge